

1 Jeffrey S. Leonard (SBN 003809)
2 Jeffrey.Leonard@SacksTierney.com
3 SACKS TIERNEY P.A.
4 4250 N. Drinkwater Blvd., 4th Floor
5 Scottsdale, AZ 85251-3693
6 Telephone: 480.425.2600

7 Attorneys for Defendants

8

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

11 Austin and Logan Flake, husband and wife,
12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 Joseph Michael Arpaio, in his official
15 capacity as Sheriff of the Maricopa County
16 Sheriff's Office, and in his personal capacity
17 along with his wife Ava J. Arpaio; Maricopa
18 County, by and through the Maricopa County
19 Board of Supervisors Denny Barney, Steve
20 Chucri, Andy Kunasek, Clint Hickman, and
21 Steve Gallardo, in their official capacities,

22 Defendants.

23 No. CV-15-01132-PHX-DLR

24 **ANSWER**

25

26 Defendants Joseph Michael Arpaio and Ava J. Arpaio (collectively "Arpaio") and
27 Maricopa County by and through the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors Denny
28 Barney, Steve Chucri, Andy Kunasek, Clint Hickman, and Steve Gallardo, in their official
capacities ("Maricopa County" and, collectively with defendants Arpaio, "Defendants")
respond to the Complaint of plaintiffs Austin and Logan Flake ("Plaintiffs") as follows:¹

29 **JURISDICTION**

30 1. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
31 as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

13

1 2. Defendants admit that Plaintiffs served a Notice of Claim more than sixty
 2 days prior to filing their Complaint, and that Defendants have not responded to the Notice
 3 of Claim; assert that there is no Amended Complaint as alleged, and that to the extent
 4 Plaintiffs purport to incorporate by reference the “facts and allegations” contained in their
 5 Notice of Claim, such “kitchen sink” pleading violates FRCP 8(a) (requiring a short and
 6 plain statement of Plaintiffs’ claim), FRCP 8(d) (requiring each allegation to be simple,
 7 concise, and direct), and FRCP 10(b) (requiring claims to be stated in numbered
 8 paragraphs, each limited as far as practicable to a single set of circumstances); and are
 9 otherwise without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 10 allegations contained in paragraph 2.

11 3. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 3.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

13 4. Upon information and belief, admit the allegations contained in paragraph 4.

14 5. Defendants admit the allegations contained in the first sentence of
 15 paragraph 5; deny the allegations contained in the last sentence of paragraph 5; and are
 16 without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 17 remaining allegations contained in that paragraph.

18 6. Defendants admit that Maricopa County is a political subdivision of the State
 19 of Arizona; assert that the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office (“MCSO”) is a non-jural
 20 entity and is an administrative arm of the office of the Sheriff, rather than of Maricopa
 21 County; and are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth
 22 of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 6.

23 7. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
 24 as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 7.

25 8. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of
 26 paragraph 8; and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 27 truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 8. Defendant Maricopa County is
 28 without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the

1 allegations contained in that paragraph.

2 9. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 9.

3 10. Defendant Arpaio admits that he did not run for the United States Senate in
4 2012; asserts that in 2011, responding to the results of an opinion poll, he stated that the
5 “door is open right now, but . . . I’m campaigning for sheriff”; and denies the remaining
6 allegations contained in paragraph 10. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge
7 or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that
8 paragraph.

9 11. Defendant Arpaio admits that Senator Flake had publicly voiced opinions
10 critical of the so-called birther movement; and denies the remaining allegations contained
11 in paragraph 11. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information
12 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

13 12. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 12.
14 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
15 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

16 13. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 13.
17 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
18 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

19 14. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
20 as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 14; and assert that if Plaintiffs are
21 referring to a specific statement they should identify the specific statement to which they
22 refer.

23 15. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 15.
24 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
25 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

26 16. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 16.
27 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
28 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

1 17. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 17.
2 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
3 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

4 18. Defendant Arpaio admits that MCSO Chief of Enforcement Operations
5 Command David Trombi reviewed certain phone records of Plaintiffs for an entirely
6 different purpose than that alleged by Plaintiffs; and denies the remaining allegations
7 contained in paragraph 18. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or
8 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that
9 paragraph.

10 19. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 19.
11 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
12 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

13 20. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 20.
14 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
15 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

16 21. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 21.
17 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
18 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

19 22. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 22.
20 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
21 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

22 23. Upon information and belief, Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations
23 contained in the last sentence of paragraph 23; and is without knowledge or information
24 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in that
25 paragraph. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to
26 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

27 24. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in the first sentence of
28 paragraph 24; and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

1 truth of the remaining allegations contained in that paragraph. Defendant Maricopa County
 2 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 3 allegations contained in that paragraph.

4 25. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
 5 as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 25.

6 26. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of
 7 paragraph 26; asserts that Jesse Todd Hughes stated that the air conditioning failed because
 8 the dogs had chewed through a wire; and denies the remaining allegations contained in that
 9 paragraph 26. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient
 10 to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

11 27. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
 12 as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

13 28. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
 14 as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 28.

15 29. Defendant Arpaio asserts that MCSO issued a press release on June 23, 2014,
 16 in which he reiterated his promise to fully investigate why so many dogs died a needless
 17 and horrible death; and denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 29.
 18 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 19 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

20 30. Defendant Arpaio asserts that MCSO hired an expert to investigate several
 21 issues concerning the HVAC system, as detailed in Exhibit C to Plaintiffs' Complaint (the
 22 Engineering Examination and Analysis Report #1 or "Engineering Report"); and denies the
 23 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 30, including the allegation that the
 24 Engineering Report was secured at his direction. Defendant Maricopa County is without
 25 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 26 contained in that paragraph.

27 31. Defendants assert that the allegations contained in paragraph 31 are an edited,
 28 incomplete, and misleading misstatement of the Engineering Report; deny that the

1 allegations contained in paragraph 31 accurately describe the conclusions set out in the
2 Engineering Report, which included the opinion that “the HVAC system was inadequate
3 and improperly configured for this type of utilization of the ‘dog room’” and that “[t]his
4 inadequate condition was exacerbated by the airflow limitations with the closed room”;
5 refer to the Engineering Report, Exhibit C to Plaintiffs’ Complaint; and otherwise deny the
6 allegations contained in that paragraph.

7 32. Defendant Arpaio admits that MCSO obtained a court order for the home’s
8 electrical records; and denies that the order was obtained at his direction, as alleged in
9 paragraph 32. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient
10 to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

11 33. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of
12 paragraph 33; asserts that the allegations that what is shown on the SRP report is
13 inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ other allegations, including the first sentence of paragraph 34;
14 and denies the remaining allegations contained in that paragraph. Defendant Maricopa
15 County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
16 allegations contained in that paragraph.

17 34. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in paragraph 34.
18 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
19 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

20 35. Defendant Arpaio admits that Deputy Kalinowski subsequently authored a
21 report; and denies that the report contained false statements, as alleged in paragraph 35.
22 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
23 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

24 36. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 36.
25 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
26 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

27 37. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 37.
28 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a

1 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

2 38. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 38.
 3 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 4 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

5 39. The allegations contained in paragraph 39 are an assertion of law, as to which
 6 no response is required.

7 40. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 40.
 8 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 9 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

10 41. Defendant Arpaio asserts that the allegations contained in paragraph 41 are an
 11 incomplete statement of the substance of the September 9, 2014 press conference, that a
 12 number of matters were discussed at that press conference, both in the form of statements
 13 and in the form of responses to questions asked, and that among the statements made were
 14 that there were four targets of the MCSO investigation, that the Maricopa County
 15 Attorney's Office would review the charges, and that MCSO was recommending the filing
 16 of 21 felony counts (one for each dead animal) as well as several misdemeanor counts; and
 17 otherwise denies the allegations contained in that paragraph. Defendant Maricopa County
 18 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 19 allegations contained in that paragraph.

20 42. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 42.
 21 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 22 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

23 43. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 43.
 24 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 25 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

26 44. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 44; and
 27 asserts that the decision whether to bring charges rested with the Maricopa County
 28 Attorney's Office. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information

1 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

2 45. The allegations contained in paragraph 45 are an assertion of law, as to which
 3 no response is required. The definition of cruelty to animals is set forth in A.R.S. §13-
 4 2910(A).

5 46. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 46.
 6 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 7 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

8 47. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 47.
 9 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 10 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

11 48. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 48.
 12 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 13 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

14 49. Defendant Arpaio admits that on October 10, 2014, the Maricopa County
 15 Attorney's Office brought the case to a grand jury; and denies the remaining allegations
 16 contained in paragraph 49. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or
 17 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that
 18 paragraph.

19 50. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in the second sentence of
 20 paragraph 50; and denies the remaining allegations contained in that paragraph. Defendant
 21 Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 22 truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

23 51. Defendant Arpaio admits that Detective Marie Trombi is the sister of David
 24 Trombi, who is the Chief of the MCSO Enforcement Operations Command and as such is a
 25 trusted member of the MCSO team; and denies the remaining allegations contained in
 26 paragraph 51. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient
 27 to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

28 52. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 52.

1 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 2 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

3 53. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in paragraph 53.
 4 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 5 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

6 54. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 54.
 7 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 8 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

9 55. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 55, including
 10 without limitation the allegation that MCSO, as opposed to MCAO, presented any case to
 11 the grand jury. Pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1 misdemeanor to knowingly
 12 disclose the nature or substance of any grand jury testimony “except in the proper discharge
 13 of official duties, at the discretion of the prosecutor to inform a victim of the status of the
 14 case or when permitted by the court in furtherance of justice.” Consequently, Defendants
 15 are not at liberty to address specifics of grand jury testimony. Defendant Maricopa County
 16 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 17 allegations contained in that paragraph.

18 56. Pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1 misdemeanor to knowingly
 19 disclose the nature or substance of any grand jury testimony “except in the proper discharge
 20 of official duties, at the discretion of the prosecutor to inform a victim of the status of the
 21 case or when permitted by the court in furtherance of justice.” Consequently, Defendants
 22 are not at liberty to address specifics of grand jury testimony. Defendant Maricopa County
 23 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 24 allegations contained in that paragraph.

25 57. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegation contained in paragraph 57 that
 26 Detective Trombi made any false statements to the grand jury; asserts that the allegations
 27 contained in that paragraph misstate the substance of the Engineering Report. Pursuant to
 28 A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1 misdemeanor to knowingly disclose the nature or substance

1 of any grand jury testimony “except in the proper discharge of official duties, at the
 2 discretion of the prosecutor to inform a victim of the status of the case or when permitted
 3 by the court in furtherance of justice.” Consequently, Defendants are not at liberty to
 4 address specifics of grand jury testimony. Defendant Maricopa County is without
 5 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 6 contained in that paragraph.

7 58. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 58.

8 59. Pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1 misdemeanor to knowingly
 9 disclose the nature or substance of any grand jury testimony “except in the proper discharge
 10 of official duties, at the discretion of the prosecutor to inform a victim of the status of the
 11 case or when permitted by the court in furtherance of justice.” Consequently, Defendants
 12 are not at liberty to address specifics of grand jury testimony. Defendant Maricopa County
 13 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 14 allegations contained in paragraph 59.

15 60. Pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1 misdemeanor to knowingly
 16 disclose the nature or substance of any grand jury testimony “except in the proper discharge
 17 of official duties, at the discretion of the prosecutor to inform a victim of the status of the
 18 case or when permitted by the court in furtherance of justice.” Consequently, Defendants
 19 are not at liberty to address specifics of grand jury testimony. Defendant Maricopa County
 20 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
 21 allegations contained in paragraph 60.

22 61. Defendant Arpaio denies that MCSO deputies provided false testimony.
 23 Pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1 misdemeanor to knowingly disclose the nature
 24 or substance of any grand jury testimony “except in the proper discharge of official duties,
 25 at the discretion of the prosecutor to inform a victim of the status of the case or when
 26 permitted by the court in furtherance of justice.” Consequently, Defendants are not at
 27 liberty to address specifics of grand jury testimony. Defendant Maricopa County is without
 28 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations

1 contained in paragraph 61.

2 62. Defendant Arpaio admits that veterinarian Bernard Mangone, who is not an
 3 employee of MCSO, testified before the grand jury; and asserts that Dr. Mangone
 4 responded to all questions asked of him. Pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2812, it is a class 1
 5 misdemeanor to knowingly disclose the nature or substance of any grand jury testimony
 6 “except in the proper discharge of official duties, at the discretion of the prosecutor to
 7 inform a victim of the status of the case or when permitted by the court in furtherance of
 8 justice.” Consequently, Defendants are not at liberty to address specifics of grand jury
 9 testimony. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to
 10 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 62.

11 63. Defendant Arpaio admits that the grand jury indicted the Flakes for 21 felony
 12 counts of animal cruelty, and 6 counts of misdemeanor animal cruelty on Tuesday,
 13 October 14, 2014; and denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 63.
 14 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 15 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

16 64. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
 17 as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

18 65. Defendant Arpaio admits that Plaintiffs were finger printed and their mug
 19 shots taken; and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 20 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 65. Defendant Maricopa County is without
 21 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 22 contained in that paragraph.

23 66. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 66.
 24 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 25 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

26 67. Defendant Arpaio admits that paragraph 67 accurately describes the initial
 27 release conditions; and denies the remaining allegations contained in that paragraph.
 28 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a

belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

68. Defendant Arpaio admits that on December 2, 2014, Plaintiffs' counsel filed a motion to dismiss; and denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 68. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

69. Defendant Arpaio admits that on December 23, 2014, MCAO moved to dismiss the case; and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 69. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

70. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 70.

71. Defendant Arpaio admits the allegations contained in paragraph 71. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

72. Defendant Arpaio admits that he addressed the media on May 6, 2015; and asserts that he stated that he was disappointed but that he understood that the objective of MCAO is to secure a conviction; and denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 72. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

73. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 73. Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

COUNT ONE

74. Defendants incorporate their responses to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 73, in response to the allegations contained in paragraph 74.

75. Defendant Arpaio asserts that he and all MCSO personnel acted at all times in accordance with their Constitutional and statutory duties. Defendant Maricopa County

1 denies the allegations contained in paragraph 75 to the extent those allegations are directed
 2 at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without knowledge or information
 3 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

4 76. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 76.
 5 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 76 to the extent
 6 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “all defendants”); and is otherwise without
 7 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 8 contained in that paragraph.

9 77. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 77.
 10 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 77 to the extent
 11 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 12 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 13 contained in that paragraph.

14 78. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 78.
 15 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 78 to the extent
 16 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 17 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 18 contained in that paragraph.

19 79. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 79.
 20 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 79 to the extent
 21 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 22 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 23 contained in that paragraph.

24 80. Defendant Arpaio asserts that he is a Constitutional officer of Maricopa
 25 County; and denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 80. Defendant
 26 Maricopa County likewise asserts that Sheriff Arpaio is a Constitutional officer of
 27 Maricopa County; and is otherwise without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 28 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

1 81. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 81.
 2 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 81 to the extent
 3 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 4 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 5 contained in that paragraph.

6 82. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 82.
 7 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 82 to the extent
 8 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 9 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 10 contained in that paragraph.

COUNT TWO

12 83. Defendants incorporate their responses to the allegations contained in
 13 paragraphs 1 through 82, in response to the allegations contained in paragraph 83.

14 84. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 84.
 15 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 84 to the extent
 16 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 17 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 18 contained in that paragraph.

19 85. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 85.
 20 Defendant Maricopa County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
 21 belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

22 86. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 86.
 23 Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 86 to the extent
 24 those allegations are directed at it (as part of “Defendants”); and is otherwise without
 25 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
 26 contained in that paragraph.

COUNT THREE

27 87. Defendants incorporate their responses to the allegations contained in

paragraphs 1 through 86, in response to the allegations contained in paragraph 87.

88. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 88. Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 88 to the extent those allegations are directed at it (as part of "Defendants"); and is otherwise without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

89. Defendant Arpaio denies the allegations contained in paragraph 89. Defendant Maricopa County denies the allegations contained in paragraph 89 to the extent those allegations are directed at it (as part of "Defendants"); and is otherwise without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in that paragraph.

90. Defendants deny each and every allegation of Plaintiffs' Complaint not specifically responded to herein.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSES

91. Plaintiffs' claims against Defendant Arpaio are barred by the doctrines of qualified or absolute immunity.

92. Plaintiffs' claims against Maricopa County are barred under *Monell v. Department of Social Services of the City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978) and *Fridena v. Maricopa County*, 18 Ariz. App. 527, 504 P.2d 58 (1972).

93. Plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages are barred against all Defendants.

94. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the existence of probable cause.

95. Any liability must be apportioned among all parties at fault, including both Plaintiffs and others who are not parties to this lawsuit, including Jesse Todd Hughes and Malesia Hughes.

96. Plaintiffs' Complaint fails, in whole or on part, to state claims upon which relief may be granted.

97. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the existence of a superseding/intervening cause.

1 98. Defendants reserve the right to assert such additional defenses as further
2 proceedings in this case may warrant.

3 Wherefore, Defendants request that Plaintiffs' Complaint and this action be
4 dismissed with prejudice, that the Court award Defendants their taxable costs and, if
5 recoverable, attorneys' fees incurred in defending this action, and that the Court grant
6 Defendants such further relief as may be appropriate.

7 DATED this 24th day of July, 2015.

SACKS TIERNEY P.A.

By: s/ Jeffrey S. Leonard
Jeffrey S. Leonard
Attorneys for Defendants

SACKS TIERNEY P.A., ATTORNEYS
4250 NORTH DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
FOURTH FLOOR
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251-3693

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 24, 2015, I electronically transmitted the foregoing ANSWER to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants:

Dennis I. Wilenchik
John "Jack" D. Wilenchik
WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
The Wilenchik & Bartness Building
2810 North Third Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

s/ Frances Fulwiler

SACKS TIERNEY P.A., ATTORNEYS
4250 NORTH DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
FOURTH FLOOR
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251-3693